

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
7

8 JAMES VINCENT BANKS,

9 Plaintiff(s),

10 v.

11 JOSEPH LOMBARDO, et al.,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:20-cv-00556-APG-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 13]

13 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to extend the time to effectuate service on  
14 several non-appearing defendants. Docket No. 13. LVMPD counsel subsequently appeared by  
15 filing an answer for Defendant Holm. Docket No. 14. It appears that counsel now knows the  
16 identity of at least some of the non-appearing defendants for whom the United States Marshal  
17 Service was rebuffed in attempting service. *See id.* at ¶ 4 (admitting that "Risppo is employed by  
18 LVMPD"); *but see* Docket No. 11 at 7 (summons returned unexecuted on the grounds that there  
19 is no employee by the name of Risppo).<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Plaintiff has provided additional information  
20 as to the identities of the non-appearing defendants. Docket No. 12.

21 Given the circumstances, the Court **DEFERS** ruling on the motion to extend time to afford  
22 LVMPD counsel an opportunity to accept service on behalf of any of the non-appearing  
23

24 <sup>1</sup> It would appear that some of the non-appearing defendants, particularly Defendants  
25 Miller and Rissippo, may be in default given the circumstances of the previous service attempt.  
26 *Compare Smith v. Saribay*, 2021 WL 1824292, at \*3 (D. Nev. Apr. 29, 2021) *with* Docket No. 12.  
27 The Court reemphasizes herein that there is an obligation to avoid unnecessary service costs. *See*  
28 *Estate of Darulis v. Garate*, 401 F.3d 1060, 1063 (9th Cir. 2005) (discussing Fed. R. Civ. P.  
4(d)(2)); *see also* *Smith*, 2021 WL 1824292, at \*2 n.5 ("Gamesmanship in the effectuation of  
service is disfavored in any context, but it would seem particularly ill-advised in the context of  
service that is being effectuated on behalf of a *pro se* prisoner by the United States Marshal Service  
pursuant to a Court order at taxpayer expense during a pandemic").

1 defendants. To that end, LVMPD counsel must file a notice by August 19, 2021, as to any of the  
2 non-appearing defendants for whom service is being accepted. With respect to any Defendant who  
3 waives service, an answer or other appropriate response to the complaint is due within 60 days of  
4 the issuance of this order. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A)(ii). With respect to any Defendant who  
5 does not waive service, the Court may impose the full costs of service that is later undertaken.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: August 4, 2021

8   
9 Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28